

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-43 are currently pending, Claims 42-43 having been added. The changes and additions to the claims do not add new matter and are supported by the originally filed specification, for example, on Fig. 13; and page 24, lines 3-13.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,696, hereafter "Araki") in view of Te et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,864, hereafter "Te").

With respect to the rejection to Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

transmitting, from the terminal unit, a first request signal to a page data providing apparatus for requesting first page data;

receiving, at the terminal unit, notification page data from the page data providing apparatus prior to receiving the first page data when the page data providing apparatus determines that the notification page data is stored on a predetermined memory location on the page data providing apparatus, the notification page data providing predetermined notification information related to the first page data; and

receiving, at the terminal unit, the first page data from the page data providing apparatus without receiving notification page data when the page data providing apparatus determines that notification page data is not stored in the predetermined memory location on the page data providing apparatus.

Applicants submit that the combination of Araki and Te fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of Claim 1.

As previously presented, Araki is directed to a method of restricting a client to refer to data of a web server by using a web browser. Fig. 1 of Araki shows a client-server system

including a client 1, network 2, and server 3. Fig. 2 shows a processing sequence between the client 1 and the server 3. First, the client acquires a page descriptive file 6 from the server 3 (S1 and S2). The page descriptive file has a confirmation button for which the user of the client can confirm that he or she will receive a service for obtaining pages under a reference restriction (see col. 6, lines 15-22). The server then sends a character sequence (password, random number, etc.) to the client (see col. 6, lines 26-38 and Fig. 2, S5). The client can then send a page-acquirement request using the password to the server (see Fig. 2, S6). The server confirms the password and sends the first page to the client, which was rewritten to refer to symbolic links 20 (see col. 6, lines 56-60, and Fig. 2, S8). The symbolic links 20 indicate substantial contents of a page descriptive file and a relevant data file 7.

The Office Action acknowledges that Araki fails to disclose or suggest all of “receiving, at the terminal unit, notification page data from the page data providing apparatus prior to receiving the first page data when the page data providing apparatus determines that the notification page data is stored on a predetermined memory location on the page data providing apparatus, the notification page data providing predetermined notification information related to the first page data,” as defined in Claim 1.

The Office Action relies on Te to remedy the deficiencies of Araki with regard to Claim 1.

As previously presented, Te is directed to a system of notifying changes in web page hyperlinked documents. Fig. 1 shows a server 110 having the system 100, which includes a subscription program 12, a notify reports program 150, a notify program 140 and a canvasser program 130. Fig. 13 illustrates that a user using a web browser requests notification of any changes to a hyperlinked document 116 by selecting notification icon 146 which is located on every web page 114 (see col. 7, lines 1-4). When the user selects the notification icon 146, subscription program 120 is invoked at server 110 and gets a copy of the current web page

114, and converts and returns a notification page 118 which has a list of hypertext links with checkboxes next to them (see col. 7, lines 5-9). The user selects certain hypertext links for which it wants to be notified of any changes to the document corresponding to the link (see col. 7, lines 10-14 and lines 52-67). The canvasser program is used to check if any of the hyperlinked document have changed (see col. 8, lines 35-52). The notify program 140 runs after the canvasser program and produces a notify memo indicating the hyperlinked documents for which the user has subscribed to which have changed (see col. 9, lines 28-38). The notify reports program 150 is a program which generates reports for the user for various functions, such as allowing a user to see what hyperlinked documents it on notification for (see col. 9, lines 46-55).

The Office Action and the Advisory Action take the position that Te discloses “receiving, at the terminal unit, notification page data from the page data providing apparatus prior to receiving the first page data when the page data providing apparatus determines that the notification page data is stored on a predetermined memory location on the page data providing apparatus, the notification page data providing predetermined notification information related to the first page data” based on Te’s description of the notify reports program 150 (see Office Action, at page 3).

As discussed above, Te describes sending a notification report via the notify reports program 150 after a canvassing program finds changes to hyperlink documents for which a user subscribed to receive updates on. The Advisory Action further states the following:

In other words, Te’s system stores the changes of a website in a predetermined memory location. The system then checks the stored changes of the website in the predetermined memory location and then provides a notification page to the user if changes are present. For example, when a user requests a page and that page has no changes, the requested page will be provided. On the other hand, if the page does have some changes, a notification page will be provided, i.e., a webpage with an icon indicating changes have been made. These changes are

stored in notify table and change table, see col. 6, lines 42-54.

However, Te never explicitly describes that the server sends the notification report (as notification page data) prior to sending first page data, which the user originally requested, when it determines that *the notification report* itself is stored in a predetermined memory location.

In other words, Te checks for changes to a website and then provides a notification report to a user. Thus, what is stored and checked are changes to the website which is separate from the notification report itself. Therefore, Te does not explicitly check for the existence of the notification report at a predetermined memory location and then provide that same notification report to the user ahead of another document (or webpage) that the user requested.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the combination of Araki and Te fails to disclose or suggest all of “receiving, at the terminal unit, notification page data from the page data providing apparatus prior to receiving the first page data when the page data providing apparatus determines that the notification page data is stored on a predetermined memory location on the page data providing apparatus, the notification page data providing predetermined notification information related to the first page data,” and “receiving, at the terminal unit, the first page data from the page data providing apparatus without receiving notification page data when the page data providing apparatus determines that notification page data is not stored in the predetermined memory location on the page data providing apparatus,” as defined in Claim 1.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Araki and Te, either alone or in proper combination.

Independent Claims 12, 23, 30, and 41 recite features similar to those of Claim 1 discussed above. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12, 23, 30, and 41 (and all

associated dependent claims) patentably distinguish over Araki and Te, either alone or in proper combination.

With respect to new dependent Claim 42, Claim 42 recites, *inter alia*,

wherein the notification page data provides
predetermined notification information related to
maintenance information of the page data providing
apparatus.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither of Araki nor Te discloses or suggest these features of new Claim 42. In particular, Applicants note that Te discloses a notification report which indicates updates to a website. However, Te does not disclose or suggest “the notification page data provides predetermined notification information related to maintenance information of the page data providing apparatus,” as defined by new Claim 42.

With respect to new dependent Claim 43, Claim 43 recites, *inter alia*,

wherein the notification page data is received at the
terminal unit without being requested from a user of the
terminal unit.


Applicants respectfully submit that neither of Araki nor Te discloses or suggest these features of new Claim 43. In particular, Applicants note that Te describes that a user clicks no a notify report icon 158 at the bottom of the home page to invoke the notify reports program 150 and request reports from notify table 160 (see col. 9, lines 48-52). Therefore, Applicants submit that Te, which the examiner relied up on to disclose the “notification page data,” does not disclose or suggest “the notification page data is received at the terminal unit without being requested from a user of the terminal unit,” as defined by new Claim 43.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that new dependent Claims 42 and 43 patentably distinguish over Araki and Te, either alone or in proper combination, for at least the foregoing reasons in addition to the reasons discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Sameer Gokhale
Registration No. 62,618

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)